

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-13 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, and 8-12 are amended. Claim 13 is newly added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,637,853 to Ahne et al. (“Ahne”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,082,911 to Murakami (“Murakami”). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 requires “printing a second reference pattern with a plurality of nozzles that are arranged along a direction in which said medium is fed.” Regarding the printing of reference patterns, the Examiner cites Ahne at col. 4, lines 22-41. However, this portion of Ahne clearly shows that the “test image 12a” is printed using “only nozzle 1.” Ahne further states that “[t]he test pattern 6 is preferably a vertical stack of test images 12, with a single test image 12 corresponding to each nozzle of the print head 24,” and that “[t]his process is repeated until each nozzle on the print head 24 has printed a test image 12.” (Ahne at col. 3, lines 62-64, and col. 4, lines 49-51.)

Since Ahne appears to print each test image using only one nozzle, while amended claim 1 requires “printing a second reference pattern with a plurality of nozzles that are arranged along a direction in which said medium is fed,” Ahne fails to teach or suggest this element of claim 1. Furthermore, because each of the test images 12 appears to be printed by a different nozzle, it would be contrary to the purpose of Ahne to modify Ahne so that each of the test images 12 is

printed “with a plurality of nozzles that are arranged along a direction in which said medium is fed.” Murakami, moreover, does not appear to make up for these deficiencies of Ahne. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 3-7 and 13.

Claims 8-12 recite elements analogous to the element of claim 1 discussed above. Thus, claims 8-12 are also patentable over Ahne and Murakami, whether applied alone or in combination, at least for reasons analogous to those described above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8-12.

New Claims

Applicant hereby adds claim 13, and respectfully submits that the matter recited therein is fully supported by the disclosure and contains no impermissible new matter.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.


Applicant herewith petitions the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time if necessary. Unless a check is attached, any fee due under 37 U.S.C. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS). The USPTO is also directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/817,153

Attorney Docket No. 10/817,153

the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly G. Myndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 19, 2007